United Nations A/64/PV.89

General Assembly

Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

89th plenary meeting
Friday, 21 May 2010, 10 a.m.
New York

President: Mr. Ali Abdussalam Treki ..... (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Sangqu (South Africa), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.15 a.m.

Agenda item 33 (*continued*)

Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects

Report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee (Fourth Committee) (A/64/407/Add.1)

The Acting President: If there is no proposal under rule 66 of the rules of procedure, I shall take it that the General Assembly decides not to discuss the report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee which is before the Assembly today.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Statements will therefore be limited to explanations of vote or position. The positions of delegations regarding the recommendations of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee have been made clear in the Committee and are reflected in the relevant official records.

May I remind members that, under paragraph 7 of decision 34/401, the General Assembly agreed that

> "When the same draft resolution is considered in a Main Committee and in plenary meeting, a delegation should, as far as possible, explain its vote only once, that is, either in the Committee or in plenary meeting, unless that delegation's vote in plenary meeting is different from its vote in the Committee."

May I remind delegations that, also in accordance with decision 34/401, explanations of vote are limited to 10 minutes and should be made by delegations from their seats.

Before we begin to take action on the recommendation contained in the report of the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, I should like to advise representatives that we are going to proceed to take a decision in the same manner as was done in the Special Political and Decolonization Committee, unless the Secretariat is notified otherwise in advance.

The Assembly has before it a draft resolution recommended by the Special Political and Decolonization Committee in paragraph 6 of its report. The Assembly will now take a decision on the draft resolution. The Special Political and Decolonization Committee adopted it without a vote. May I take it that the Assembly wishes to do the same?

The draft resolution was adopted (resolution 64/266).

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of agenda item 33?

It was so decided.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

10-37119 (E)

Please recycle

Agenda items 48 and 114 (*continued*)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Follow-up to the outcome of the Millennium Summit

Report of the Secretary-General (A/64/701)

Mr. Hardeep Singh Puri (India): Let me begin by thanking all the panelists and participants for their presentations and useful insights on the emerging concept of human security. We would also like to recognize the personal interest of the Permanent Representative of Japan in pursuing this debate in the United Nations and to thank the Secretary-General for his report (A/64/701).

The concept of human security, from a layman's perspective, might appear quite obvious and is perhaps well captured in paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1) as freedom from fear, freedom from want and the right of all individuals to live in dignity in order to fully develop their potential.

However, as noted in paragraph 143, there is a need to clearly define the concept of human security in the multilateral context. The basic framework for this discussion was, of course, provided in a reference in the same paragraph to the three mutually interlinked issues of security, livelihood and dignity, with the individual at its centre.

In our discussions on the definition, it is important to ensure that human security is clearly situated within the parameters of non-aggression, non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, the right to national self-defence and State sovereignty, which are the bedrock of international relations and domestic governance. The definition needs to recognize that the primary responsibility for human security rests with States and Governments. Obviously, there can be no place for interventionism in the concept of human security. The concept must be people-centred and should go beyond the narrow framework of protection of populations from physical insecurity, as in situations of war and conflict, to a much broader framework that encompasses multidimensional and comprehensive parameters, with development as an important pillar.

We recognize the complexity associated with this concept and its multidimensional linkages at the national, regional and international levels. The major international challenges of today in fact require the tackling of the persistent and chronic social and economic challenges which confront States. At the United Nations, we have pledged to address these challenges in numerous ways, but most importantly by focusing on the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals.

The Secretary-General's report also meticulously establishes the direct linkage of the exacerbation of these challenges by the recent global crises, including the financial and economic crisis, energy price fluctuations, food security challenges, and the adverse ramifications of climate change. These challenges, of course, are no longer confined within national boundaries. In this regard, it is imperative to stress the need for genuine international cooperation, which recognizes the inherent constraints many developing countries face, especially in mobilizing internal and external resources for socio-economic and development activities.

In India, we are committed to ensuring fundamental rights and dignity to every citizen. In recent years, the thrust of our socio-economic development has, moreover, moved on to inclusive growth, that is, bringing the fruits of economic development to all sections of our society, particularly in rural India and among the more vulnerable. It is our belief that a comprehensive approach to human security is the only way that this concept would help every human being explore his or her potential to the maximum, while pursuing a life of dignity in a safe and healthy environment.

Mr. Haroon (Pakistan): We thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this debate on the Secretary-General's report on human security (A/64/701). We thank the Secretary-General for putting it before this Hall and, of course, following in my Indian colleague's footsteps, we recognize the immense contribution Japan has made in taking this matter forward.

In 2005, we got together as sovereign States and decided that we needed to dilate on the concept of human security in the world. Over the past 24 hours, with maybe more today, we have heard various concepts enunciated. There have been different

nuances in different contexts, but let us first remember what, in founding the United Nations, we brought to the Charter that is also relevant to this document. We decided to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. We decided to reaffirm our faith in fundamental human rights and in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small. We decided to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

The afore-cited purposes of the United Nations Charter presented a balanced encapsulation of the concept of human security, but the fruition of the purposes has, at best, been uneven. Continuing and growing financial and political disparities fly in the face of calls for equal rights for individuals and nations. The world has yet to reach a stage in which human security is extant in letter and spirit, that is, a state in which all human beings have equal rights to life, liberty, food, health, employment and opportunities to live with compassion and dignity.

Having reviewed the Secretary-General's report, I have the following thoughts to offer. First, human security requires a gradual approach in which models, such as that for poverty eradication, are developed for subsequent replication as human security projects.

Second, to foster trust, human security interventions should be made in areas which are acceptable to all Member States.

Third, it is important to address entrenched systematic inequalities, such as agricultural subsidies, that negatively affect the developing agrarian economies and to promote agricultural productivity in developing countries through, inter alia, technology transfers. This relates specifically to the continent of Africa.

Fourth, it is essential to expand the scope of human security-related work beyond humanitarian agencies to include development entities, including such United Nations agencies as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Environment Programme. Those agencies' input will help impart greater clarity and relevance to the concept of human security.

Fifth, in regard to different attempts to define the impetus for human security, the report identifies three common elements: current and emerging threats, the protection and empowerment of people, and non-encroachment on State sovereignty. While these elements could provide a basis for further discussion, there is a need to avoid subjective interpretations of current and emerging threats, which is the main reason for the division of debate in this house.

Sixth, human security should be a unifying rather than a divisive concept and should promote intercultural, inter-religious and inter-faith dialogue, with cooperation and understanding being key words.

Seventh, the right to food, the right to adequate housing and sanitation, and the right to adequate standards of health should be indispensable parameters for human security.

We must not forget how human security, which forms the core of this document, needs to be remembered. I would like to cite the earliest definition that arose in this Hall: to be able to give the right to protect the vital core of all human lives in ways that enhance human freedoms and human fulfilment. That should be something we must remember and not forget.

And to this very aspect of human rights, security and development, I would like to add that there is a basis upon which we can work, and which we could take as common international ground without interfering with anyone, but recommending that three important concepts would be part of a minimum delineation and understanding of human security. The first concept, which the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is developing, is the legal empowerment of the poor; the second is the economic improvement of the poor; and the third is the empowerment of women, a concept that the UNDP, in working through human rights declarations and development, is bringing to the fore, especially in Asia, where 70 per cent of the population is young people. Therefore, because mothers care for feeding and dressing the young and look out for their health and their education, roughly 75 per cent of the population as a whole would be reached under the simple rubric of the empowerment of women. These are important aspects that cannot and should not be in any way ignored.

Finally, I would add by way of conclusion that the unequal progress in and distribution of the promised fruits of globalization are major challenges to human security. Undemocratic global decision-making exacerbates apprehension about the possible abuse of

human security for political ends. Accordingly, the promotion of equitable global governance is necessary for universal ownership of the concept of human security.

Mr. Kim Bonghyun (Republic of Korea): At the outset, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for introducing his report on human security (A/64/701). At the same time, I would also like to thank President Treki of the General Assembly and the delegation of Japan for their initiative in arranging this opportune occasion to exchange views on human security in the United Nations system as a follow-up to the World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

The Republic of Korea, as a member of the Friends of Human Security, has recognized the substantial contribution that the notion of human security has made to the work of the United Nations on every occasion where this issue has been discussed. Our view of human security is that, first, it is a useful concept that complements the traditional concept of security. The important goals of the United Nations — peace and security, development and human rights — are all closely linked to human security. Similarly, these goals are closely linked with one another, despite their perceived differences. In many ways, human security is the specific point of convergence among them. Given the multinational and complementary nature of human security, our work for peace, development and human rights could and should be viewed through a framework that reflects the notion of human security.

Secondly, my delegation views human security as a relatively new approach for addressing various threats or challenges, rather than as a binding principle or overarching legal issue. Rather than top-down, human security brings a human face of insecurity to the forefront in a more bottom-up approach. In this connection, my delegation believes that, with continued work on this significant issue, the broad idea of human security can eventually be put in place in the field in such a way that the focus is on individuals and communities through robust protection and empowerment. It could be an important new tool for the international community to use as it seeks to make greater progress in achieving our goals in real and tangible terms.

In this regard, my delegation welcomes the report of the Secretary-General on human security. It effectively brings the membership up to date on some of the key developments and advances that have been made on the issue of human security since the 2005 World Summit, outlining the principle for incorporating human security and its application in current organizational practices and priorities. The report also provides a definitional overview vis-à-vis State sovereignty and the responsibility to protect.

By specifically applying the concept of human security to different and often varied priorities of the United Nations, the report of the Secretary-General conjoins the notion of human security with tangible issues that affect not only the work of the Organization but the entire world. Indeed, it provides a succinct look at the multidimensional impact of the economic and food crises, global health threats and climate change. That is then contrasted with human security's inherent linkages with the prevention of violent conflicts, peacekeeping and peacebuilding.

It is critical to restate, as noted in the report of the Secretary-General, that the application of the concept of human security does not bring additional layers to the work of the United Nations. Instead, the notion of human security reinforces and complements the activities of the Organization in these critical fields. We are confident that human security has an important role to play in the future of the Organization that will benefit immensely from its forward-thinking, synergistic application.

In conclusion, the Republic of Korea would like to reiterate its strong belief that every human being is entitled to live free from fear in full dignity. In this regard, we hope that the United Nations can continue to explore ways to make practical use of the notion of human security for the benefit of people and make a profound impact on the ground.

Mr. Koterec (Slovakia): Allow me to start by expressing my appreciation to the delegations of Japan and Mexico for taking the initiative, with the kind support of the President of the General Assembly, to organize this important discussion on human security. My delegation also welcomes the report of the Secretary-General (A/64/701), which provides an excellent basis for today's deliberations.

The issue of human security is both relevant to and promising in fostering security, prosperity and a

dignified human life. It contains valuable information on the implementation of important elements of the World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1) and poses many thought-provoking questions on the way forward.

I wish to stress that Slovakia aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union. However, in addition, I would like to make some brief remarks in my national capacity.

Slovakia is a strong supporter of the concept of human security because, in our view, it reflects a close linkage between the three pillars of United Nations activity: security, development and human rights. Even though the concept brings a new way of thinking about security, putting people at the centre, we agree with the opinion that it should complement and conjoin the activities of the United Nations, bring added value and not add an extra layer to the Organization's structures or cause duplication of action. While the concept is broadly defined and cross-cutting, its individual components are already well developed and continue to be pursued. As an example, we need but mention the establishment of the Peacebuilding Commission.

Slovakia, as the initiator of the United Nations Group of Friends on security sector reform, places the notion of human security at the centre of its activities in this area. As the 2006 European Commission concept paper on European Community support for security sector reform rightly put it, citizens should be able to expect the State to be capable of maintaining peace and guaranteeing the strategic security interests of the country, and of ensuring that their lives, property and political, economic and social rights are safeguarded.

With security and development interlinked, the need for security sector reform is often a precondition for conflict prevention and for stable and sustainable post-conflict development. There are real cases when an inability to carry out reform of the security sector led to the collapse of peacekeeping or peacebuilding efforts. Let me quote my former Foreign Minister, speaking at the regional workshop held in Cape Town, South Africa, in 2007:

> "One cannot omit the most noble, and in fact the ultimate, objective of security sector reform, which is improvement of people's lives through this public service. Security sector reform cannot be aimed at mere institution- and capacity-building. Institution- and capacity-building are necessary preconditions for successful security sector reform, but they cannot be the goal per se. Security sector reform should therefore be accompanied by implementation of the principles of good governance, transitional justice, democratic accountability and respect for human rights. Security sector reform will make sense only if it brings about concrete improvements in the everyday life of people. It is important that they can see the benefits and trust the effort made, support it and participate in it."

Effective coordination of international efforts and their individual participants in post-conflict areas is another key point we would like to make. Yes, that has been said many times. However, we hope that the long-lasting processes of United Nations system reform, particularly the concept of "delivering as one", can bring tangible results very soon and reinforce the central role of the United Nations.

Furthermore, Slovakia is convinced that the role of regional, subregional and other international organizations should be promoted. These organizations play a crucial role in developing and implementing relevant programmes. From that perspective, let me mention two concrete activities sponsored by Slovakia. Human security and its linkages to peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations were intensively discussed during the regional workshops held in Buenos Aires in September 2009 and in Jakarta in March 2010. The workshops were organized by Slovakia together with Argentina and Indonesia, respectively, in order to ensure that regional views are better reflected in broader United Nations policies in this field. As the Co-Chairs' statement from Buenos Aires concludes, the United Nations approach to security sector reform could benefit substantially from regional experiences in areas such as the prevention of violence. This was recognized to be of increasing importance, given the continuous paradigm shift in international security towards a human security agenda. We are also encouraged to see the emphasis placed by the World Bank on linking security and development, conflict prevention and prosperity and justice.

Last but not least, I would like to emphasize the role of non-State actors, which often play a central role in identifying a problem, helping to implement relevant policies and programmes, carrying out oversight as well as providing social services. Their engagement has to be recognized and further supported.

In conclusion, I would like to reiterate once again that Slovakia considers the concept of human security to be a part of the international community's endeavour to tackle the core issues which the United Nations was built to address. The concept of human security highlights synergy in United Nations endeavours for a good cause.

Mr. Musayev (Azerbaijan): Azerbaijan aligns itself with the statement made on behalf of the European Union. However, we would also like to contribute to the discussion in our national capacity.

At the outset, I would like to thank the President of the General Assembly for convening the informal panel discussion and the thematic debate and to thank the Secretary-General for the submission of his report on human security (A/64/701), which provides a comprehensive update on developments related to the advancement of human security since the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

In 2005, heads of State and Government stressed the right of people to live in freedom and dignity, free from poverty and despair, and they recognized that all individuals, in particular vulnerable people, are entitled to freedom from fear and freedom from want, with an equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential. To that end, we committed ourselves to discuss and define the notion of human security.

The General Assembly held a thematic debate on 22 May 2008 to reflect on the scope of the human security concept and to further explore ways to follow up on the reference to this notion in the 2005 World Summit Outcome. Although various interpretations and understandings were presented during the course of the deliberations, the thematic debate undoubtedly demonstrated the growing interest in the concept. Despite obvious divergences, the emphasis was on the need for a new culture of international relations that calls for comprehensive, integrated and people-centred approaches.

As the report of the Secretary-General points out, human security is gaining wide support in the United Nations and other forums. Notable contributions have been made in defining the notion of human security since it was first introduced as a distinct concept in the 1994 *Human Development Report* of the United Nations Development Programme. Thus, we take note of the key human security initiatives undertaken by Governments, organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, regional and subregional intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental institutions.

The report of the Secretary-General refers to the need for an expanded paradigm of security in order to better address the multifaceted, complex and interrelated challenges that we face today. Human security is inseparably linked with concepts such as national security; the settlement of conflicts and peacebuilding; people-centred socio-economic development and human rights; the eradication of poverty; and addressing the effects of climate change. At the same time, human security depends on a number of critical factors, among them the need to ensure, first, that parameters for behaviour are based on the normative standards set by the Charter of the United Nations and international law.

The consequences of contemporary armed conflicts are devastating, from threatening the very existence of States and undermining their sovereignty, integrity and unity to the high proportion of civilian casualties, massive forced population displacements and the creation of mono-ethnic areas which resemble the terrible concept of ethnic cleansing. Indeed, conflicts mainly affect civilian populations and pose major risks to people's survival, livelihoods and dignity, and thus to human security.

The report of the Secretary-General makes it clear that human security underscores the universality and primacy of a set of freedoms that are fundamental to human life. In that context, protecting civilians and upholding humanitarian law, with special focus on vulnerable groups such as children, women, the elderly, refugees and internally displaced persons, are essential in conflict situations and must remain an absolute priority for the United Nations as a whole, for the General Assembly, for the Security Council and, above all, for Member States.

Taking into consideration what I have said, human security, as we understand it, is expected to serve to enhance the sovereignty of States and strengthen their integrity, unity and stability in an effective and sustainable manner, as well as to focus on long-term prevention and people-centred responses.

We share the view reflected in the report of the Secretary-General that human security should not bring additional layers to the work of the United Nations. At

the same time, the United Nations is instrumental in addressing this topic and related issues, although additional discussions are needed on the notion of human security, its advancement and its application to the current priorities of the Organization.

We look forward to the continuation of constructive dialogue and to further reports of the Secretary-General on progress in mainstreaming human security in United Nations activities.

Mr. Wolfe (Jamaica): We thank the Secretary-General for his report (A/64/701), which provides a very good basis for further discussion and elaboration of the concept of human security. We also acknowledge the role of Japan and other delegations concerned in bringing this issue forward.

Let me state at the outset that Jamaica supports the holistic approach taken in the 1994 *Human Development Report* of the United Nations Development Programme, which argued in favour of a new paradigm of sustainable human development, a new form of development cooperation and a restructured system of global institutions, characterized as freedom from fear and freedom from want. It has been argued quite convincingly that the concept of human security has implications for all the pillars of the United Nations agenda: the peace and security, human rights and development dimensions, among others.

Human security is often referenced in the context of the interrelatedness of security, development and the protection of civilians. Moreover the concept underscores the need for multisectoral responses and collaboration among all stakeholders: Government, non-governmental organizations, and regional and international organizations.

Human security seeks to distinguish itself from traditional notions of national security that focus on the protection of the State from external threats, and to give greater credence to the protection of individuals and communities. In this context, a people-centred view of security is critical to maintaining national, regional and global stability and to addressing, in a comprehensive manner, the complexity and interrelatedness of the new security threats of the twenty-first century.

In general, Jamaica can agree with the following positions articulated in the report: First, a people-centred approach is necessary to solving global threats and challenges. Second, in the context of the interconnected nature of threats and challenges facing the international community today, there is urgent need for an expanded paradigm of national security. Third, in order to find a permanent solution to the myriad of threats and challenges, it is necessary to identify and address their root causes. Fourth, approaches to addressing human insecurities must be tailored to local contexts. Fifth, in addressing human insecurities, there can be no distinction between civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, which are indivisible and mutually reinforcing. Sixth, human security is inconsistent with interference in the internal affairs of sovereign States and is also inconsistent with the use of force against sovereign nation-States. Seventh, human security, if implemented with the input and buy-in of all stakeholders within a society, can strengthen a State's overall security and, in the long run, contribute to a more stable international security environment. And eighth, the twin pillars of empowerment and prevention which underpin the concept of human security are mutually reinforcing and must form the basis for action and serve as the barometer by which success in this area is judged.

We further underscore that all efforts to augment human security in various communities and countries around the globe must be part of a nationally owned process. At the same time we would like to express a word of caution based on the following factors.

The concept of human security, as we all know, is mired in controversy because of the lack of consensus over its precise definition, the threats from which individuals should be protected and the appropriate mechanisms for responding to those threats. Human security is also an emerging theme, and not an accepted norm under international humanitarian law. The concept of human security is therefore still very vague and requires further development.

We note that there are two schools of thought on the scope of the concept of human security. On the one hand, it is to be considered solely in the context of violent threats associated with civil war, genocide and the displacement of populations. However, the second and much broader perspective of the human security agenda includes a range of threats, including those resulting from environmental disasters, disease, poverty and general economic deprivation.

We also wish to point out that one of the recommendations of the report is for a report on progress in mainstreaming human security in United Nations activities to be submitted every two years. However, we would wish to ask this question: has there been General Assembly approval for the mainstreaming of this concept? How can we proceed to mainstream human security without consensus on its definition and scope? Is there a framework or plan of action through which this mainstreaming is expected to take place?

We need further clarification on those issues.

Let me turn next to peacebuilding and peacekeeping. In countries emerging from conflict, immediate concerns about personal safety and security are coupled with equally urgent concerns for adequate food and shelter. There is also the question of ensuring long-term sustainable growth and development as a means of preventing a relapse into conflict.

Peacebuilding must be considered in a holistic manner. The rule of law, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, security sector reform and the holding of elections are all crucial components of the peacebuilding strategy but should not in any manner preclude efforts to ensure sustainable development in countries emerging from conflict. Rather, as stated by the Secretary-General in his address to the recent joint meeting of the Economic and Social Council and the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), they must work on parallel tracks. They are all factors which impact on human security and which must be addressed simultaneously and over a sustained period, to facilitate meaningful results on the ground in post-conflict countries.

The current review of the Peacebuilding Commission should seek to fashion new approaches and to strengthen areas where there have been successes in its working life so far. In this context, lessons learned over the period of existence of the Commission, as well as the results of the work of the Commission's Working Group on Lessons Learned and input from the Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881) will prove invaluable to the process.

The immediate challenge for post-conflict countries remains how best to quickly return to normalcy and a path towards sustainable growth and development. For this to be accomplished, human security must be paramount in every poverty reduction strategy and strategic framework for peacebuilding adopted for countries on the Peacebuilding Commission's agenda. Socio-economic concerns must also be addressed, including those relating to youth, women and other vulnerable groups. Employment generation, education and training, investment and private sector renewal should form the core of promoting human security and peacebuilding.

In a post-conflict scenario, the reintegration of former combatants must be given special attention. Priority should also be directed towards enhancing dialogue and reconciliation among political parties and warring factions and, where necessary, sincere efforts must made to settle outstanding issues, particularly those identified as a source of conflict. Internally displaced persons and returning refugees must find comfort in returning to their former places of abode. As has been mentioned several times during this debate, a gender perspective must also be fully integrated into all peacebuilding efforts.

Jamaica has always maintained that there should be seamless synergy between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. There is also a need for stronger coordination between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Field Support and the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). Following the ongoing review process, the Peacebuilding Commission and the PBSO must be further strengthened to ensure that the Office remains a key mechanism for ensuring the coherence of all activities of the Organization in post-conflict situations.

In conclusion, let me repeat that, notwithstanding its potential positive aspects, the concept of human security remains vague and therefore requires further elaboration. That lack of clarity has no doubt reinforced the perception that it may be used as a tool or excuse for interference in the internal affairs of States. What is therefore required is for the concept to be addressed in a far more holistic and broader perspective, taking into account the interrelatedness of the three pillars of the United Nations system and the wide range of threats and global economic risk factors that pose serious challenges to human security.

Let me reiterate that equal attention should be given to the development dimension in providing human security; otherwise, countries run the risk of sliding back into conflict. Finally, that also highlights the need for a change in the current global order to

reverse global economic imbalances and distortions in international trade and to address climate change and other existing challenges to sustainable development, so as to ensure the very credibility of the concept of human security.

Mr. Kurer (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*spoke in Arabic*): I would like to thank the President for having organized this meeting to discuss the report of the Secretary-General on the concept of human security (A/64/701). This is an important subject as it relates to liberation from fear and poverty and ensures that people can live in dignity. In essence, the subject is rooted in the Charter of the United Nations.

An essential aspect of human security is the assumption by Governments of the main responsibility for safeguarding the security, livelihoods and dignity of their citizens. This requires cooperation among Governments and States in order to identify threats and confront them on the basis of their own national priorities and strategies and the best use of their resources to promote human security and stability domestically, regionally and internationally.

Regional and international organizations to which Libya belongs have taken up these issues. For instance, the African Union and the League of Arab States have considered all the various aspects of this subject. We have taken a number of steps to ensure the security of our peoples in the face of worsening challenges that threaten human security, including fluctuations in food prices, climate change, the international financial and economic crisis, cross-border crime, armed conflict, trafficking in humans and drugs, and illegal immigration. All of these threats have led to conflict and outbreaks of violence, which endanger human security and transcend the traditional concept of international peace, security and stability. If poor countries are to be able to address those issues, there must be international cooperation to push negotiations on achieving development and on reaching consensus towards the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

Human security requires concrete and stable national institutions to guarantee peace and security and promote human development and dignity. To that end, we must establish international partnerships based on the sovereign equality of and mutual respect between States, and avoid the use of force or sanctions against developing countries, which can undermine development and lead to tensions, acts of violence and armed conflicts, and possibly to grave humanitarian crises with serious and complex human, economic, political and security costs at the national, regional and international levels.

As an African Arab country of the Mediterranean, Libya both influences and is influenced by the geopolitical climate and its effect on what we might call geo-human security — whether in Palestine or the Middle East, Africa in general or the Mediterranean region. My country has therefore tried to resolve conflicts in various regions in Africa, convinced that regional and international cooperation is necessary to address economic and social security challenges. Some of those conflicts date back to the colonial period, its destructive wars and their impact on our peoples and States, which should be compensated for the damage they suffered at the time. This would help them to develop their national capabilities and to reject unjust and unbalanced conditions in unilateral negotiations. Human security efforts have illustrated how we can have a positive impact on the threats to peoples and societies in developing countries, especially in Africa and the Arab region.

In conclusion, let me say that we support the recommendations in the Secretary-General's report to strengthen multilateral cooperation through the United Nations, its various bodies and mechanisms, and regional and subregion organizations, which should be based on respect for the sovereignty and independence of peoples. This is a new, people-centred culture in international relations that requires global ways of strengthening human security.

Mr. Bairagi (Nepal): I wish to begin by thanking the President for convening this important meeting pursuant to paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), and yesterday's special panel discussion on the theme "People-centred approaches: the added value of human security". It is equally important to acknowledge that the Government of Japan has attached great importance to this issue. I also thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report on human security (A/64/701), as well as for his introductory remarks to the Assembly.

The concept of human security is still evolving. Yet, we acknowledge the contribution made by the Friends of Human Security, the Human Security

Network and the Independent Commission on Human Security in advancing the concept over the years.

We are participating in this debate with the expectation that the intergovernmental discussion on the concept of human security will help to enhance our understanding of the issue involved and its practical utility in the overall context of multilateral policy deliberations. The report of the Secretary-General has indeed made an attempt to shed light on some of the important issues from the perspective of human security. We believe that the report of the Secretary-General provides a good basis for substantive discussion to develop a universally accepted definition of human security. Our deliberations here should aim that objective.

Human security conditions may vary significantly across countries and communities. It is equally important to understand that both the causes and manifestations of insecurity depend on a complex interaction of local, national, regional and international factors. In that context, we underscore the usefulness of having a comprehensive, integrated and people-centred approach to deal with a multitude of contemporary challenges having significant implications for human security.

In fashioning such an approach, it is important, first and foremost, to underscore the sanctity of national authority and responsibility as paramount and indispensable in providing security to people and promoting their well-being. It is our firm belief that the concept of human security needs to be defined and put into action in conformity with the principles and purposes of the United Nations as enshrined in its Charter.

It is acknowledged that freedom from fear, freedom from want and freedom to live in dignity constitute the core of human security. Those freedoms serve as the bedrock of the United Nations Charter, and the United Nations is entrusted with advancing those freedoms. However, for a variety of reasons, the world, under one umbrella, has not achieved an identical level of development for everyone. That means that there is a problem somewhere.

What is visible is that the gap between the rich and poor is constantly widening. Consequently, a large chunk of humanity is still struggling to emerge from the dehumanizing conditions of poverty and hunger. Unfortunately, the plight of those people has been further compounded in the wake of multiple crises for which they are not responsible. As a consequence, for the first time in history, more than 1 billion people are now hungry. That speaks of a humanitarian crisis of colossal a scale that challenges our conscience.

There exist a number of other pressing challenges to the security and survival of poor people around the world. Poverty is still all-pervasive, and it creates a significant obstacle to the realization of human development goals. The global financial and economic crisis, together with the energy crisis and the adverse and uneven impacts of climate change, has not only reversed hard-earned development gains — including those made towards achieving the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) — but has also threatened to push the livelihoods of millions of people in poor countries to the margins.

Mrs. Gallardo Hernández (El Salvador), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The spread of deadly diseases in recent years, one after another, also poses a serious threat to people everywhere, and more so in poor countries. Conflict-torn countries lack adequate economic and social infrastructure for recovery, reconstruction, rehabilitation and reintegration. Building that vital infrastructure is essential to ensuring sustainable peace and stability in those countries.

Our understanding is that the reduction of poverty and hunger, the removal of existential threats arising from climate change, global pandemics and preventable conflicts, and the creation of an enabling environment for the development of human potential for all should constitute the foundation of the concept of human security. Meeting the challenges of human security requires, inter alia, an enhanced flow of financial resources and a supportive international environment, together with a large policy space for the countries concerned. In order for poor countries to be able to build on that foundation on a sustainable basis, the entrenched imbalances in the international economic, financial and trade relationships must be rectified, for under the current systems the equitable and judicious sharing of the benefits of globalization has failed to materialize.

In less than four months from now, our leaders will assemble in New York to review the MDGs. That occasion will be the last such, but it must be made a decisive event for the international community to

galvanize global partnership towards achieving the MDGs. Poor countries are the ones lagging behind in meeting many of the MDG targets. It is not because they lack political will and commitment to achieve the MDGs, but because they confront serious structural impediments and high levels of economic vulnerability in their development process.

We look forward to an enhanced global partnership so that issues, concerns, difficulties and special needs and aspirations of countries like ours are addressed in a comprehensive manner that takes into account the severity of the problems we confront. Building productive capacity must be a long-term goal of international assistance. Sustaining MDG achievements will require sustained economic growth and sustainable development; otherwise, our achievements will prove to be transitory and ad hoc.

Addressing the challenges to human security is a primary responsibility of a nation. However, challenges of a transboundary nature, given their scope and impact, require collective solutions at the regional and global levels. As a multilateral framework for a global policy discourse, the United Nations is legitimately placed to address the multitude of challenges to human security, in keeping with the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

Mrs. Bibalou (Gabon) (*spoke in French*): First of all, I would like to thank the Assembly President, Japan and Mexico for having taken the initiative to organize this important meeting. My delegation would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his excellent presentation of his report in document (A/64/701), which is devoted to the issue of human security in accordance with paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). We very much appreciate its scope and clarity.

The report takes up numerous aspects associated with the sovereignty of States, inter alia, and to the responsibility to protect. It also outlines some ways of promoting human security at the national, regional and international levels.

The main definition of human security put forth by the report has to do with human dignity and the right of every person to pursue happiness and well-being. There can in fact be no security or development without fully meeting the basic needs of peoples. It is important to promote initiatives and policies that aim at promoting development with a human face that is based on justice, equality, solidarity and peaceful coexistence.

In Gabon, human security is at the heart of the Government's priorities in the field of sustainable development. That concept is in line with our community values of brotherhood and solidarity. In that connection, the Government has always invested in the implementation of policies aimed at improving the living conditions of the most vulnerable people, such as women, girls, handicapped persons and the elderly. Such efforts based on solidarity contribute to strengthening the national unity and well-being of all our people, including displaced persons and refugees who have found asylum in our land after having left conflict areas.

With regard to that last group of people, the Government is working in partnership with the Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees, non-governmental organizations and other United Nations specialized agencies in Gabon. That dynamic cooperation has resulted in community projects that are fully in keeping with combating poverty and exclusion. Those programmes make it possible for refugees to gradually achieve economic and social inclusion, while at the same time benefiting local populations and contributing to harmony and social tranquility in host areas. The three main components of the programmes are revenue-generating activities, agriculture, and vocational training for target groups such as young mothers and children who have dropped out of school in the refugee community.

The encouraging results achieved in this area would not have been possible without the active cooperation of the United Nations and our development partners. Here I would like to welcome the recent and laudable decision of the Japanese Government to provide Gabon, through the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security, the amount of $2,194,426. This donation will be used to improve the situation of refugees and vulnerable populations living in Gabon. It joins other initiatives that have already been implemented in this area by Japan in partnership with the Government of Gabon.

To conclude, allow me to agree with the Secretary-General when he affirms in the summary of his report that

> "[k]ey human security initiatives undertaken by Governments, regional and subregional

intergovernmental organizations, as well as the organizations and bodies of the United Nations system, are presented as examples of the reach of this important concept and its growing acceptance."

With these words I wish to highlight the major role played by the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security in the implementation of programmes that seek to improve the living conditions of populations even beyond national borders.

Mr. Tagle (Chile) (*spoke in Spanish*): I thank the President for convening this debate for exchanging views on the important report of the Secretary General on human security (A/64/701), presented to the Assembly in accordance with paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), in which the heads of State and Government committed themselves to discuss and define the concept of human security.

Chile, as a member of the Human Security Network, associates itself with the statement made yesterday by Costa Rica in its capacity as Chair of the Network (see A/64/PV.88).

In our view, the foundation of human security is the dignity of every human being, with no distinction whatsoever. Unlike classical security based on the concept of the nation-State, human security makes each person the focus of rights in the international sphere.

Chile sees human security as an emerging concept involving a commitment by national States to perform without restriction in the sphere of law and multilateralism in order to care for their citizens and for any individual, wherever he or she may come from. This perspective also presupposes progress in the conceptualization of security, which has attracted growing international support. This is due both to the recognition granted to the individual in international law and to the priority that respect for and promotion of human rights has on the international agenda. That is why the Assembly is today discussing the concept of human security and its usefulness for the international community — a debate in which Chile has been involved from the beginning.

This new concept goes beyond the physical integrity of individuals in situations of crisis or international armed conflicts, since it also includes threats to personal integrity derived from internal armed conflicts, daily social violence, the availability of small arms and light weapons, organized crime, natural disasters, climate change and financial crises, among other serious threats to people.

Like any bold doctrine, human security has had its detractors and problems. Some actors in the international system distrust human security, since they believe it can be a pretext for intervening in States' internal affairs in order to alter their conduct, violating their sovereignty. That idea is wrong. As emphasized in section III of the Secretary-General's report, one of the ultimate goals of human security is precisely to strengthen national institutions so as to be able to deal with current problems and threats to the population.

Our effort to operationalize the concept of human security will bear fruit in the joint endeavour to apply theoretical principles to practice so as to be specific about the contribution of human security to tackling the problems on the international agenda, since we believe that human security, by definition, provides a new way of dealing with the threats on the international agenda. As was pointed out by Professor Fukuda-Parr yesterday, human security provides a framework for analyzing the prevention of conflicts and fighting poverty.

In view of the width of this new concept of security and its scope, we believe that it has a huge political potential that can be translated into specific actions to benefit people. Human security should not be opposed to classical national security, as shown in the report of the Secretary-General, but — quite the contrary — should complement it to form an integrating whole that will result in a substantial improvement in standards of individual security.

Mr. Suazo (Honduras) (*spoke in Spanish*): First of all, the delegation of Honduras would like to echo the thanks that have been expressed to the President of the General Assembly for his decision to organize this debate on human security, in line with the mandate of the 2005 World Summit.

In presenting his first report (A/64/701), the Secretary-General stressed the importance of human security in attaining economic and social development as a concept very close to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter (see A/64/PV.87). That report, in addition to being very useful for this debate, is a source of new ideas and concepts that will help us

a good deal on the path to adopting decisions on related items on our agenda.

Yesterday as well we had the opportunity to listen to and participate in a panel organized by the presidency of the General Assembly. We want to thank the panelists for their presentations, which cleared up a lot of doubts about some of the principles and ideas and the scope of what should be understood by human security — although it was recognized that this concept has still not been clearly defined and that we should continue to study it.

Contrary to the outdated concept of national security as linked to the interests of the nation-State — which consequently limited the responsibility of the State to protect its own citizens in the face of extreme situations such as serious violations of human rights and of the right to enjoy fundamental rights and freedoms — human security is now becoming a much broader, more comprehensive concept that associates individual and collective security with all rights inherent to the human being. It is in this context that in our country we are aware of the need to recognize and implement the concept, which we consider to be intimately linked to the Millennium Development Goals as well as to human development in a horizontal and a vertical fashion.

Honduras has taken on the commitment to consolidate and strengthen the development of a human security policy within the framework of the Plan de Nación: Visión de País, a plan for the country proposed by the President of the Republic, Don Porfirio Lobo Sosa. The plan is consistent with international principles in this area and aims to bring about social peace, internal security and national development in a harmonized way.

The initiatives that Japan and other Member States have formulated in this forum should be given particular attention by the international community, since it is vital for the survival of human beings in a globalized and interdependent world to confront together the armed conflicts, natural disasters, climate change, extreme poverty, discrimination in all its forms, pandemics, nuclear risks, food insecurity, migration and crimes against humanity, to mention just a few.

As has been mentioned, there are other issues that should be considered and included in the definition and concept of human security. Our country thus believes that it is the responsibility of all States to contribute to the development of national and international policies and mechanisms to jointly address those various threats in a multidimensional and multisectoral approach.

It is for those reasons that Honduras shares and will support initiatives by the countries members of the Friends of Human Security. We are committed to finding a broad definition of that concept, which, it should be understood, should be constructively observed in meeting the commitments flowing from its implementation.

Mr. Loayza Barea (Plurinational State of Bolivia) (*spoke in Spanish*): The Plurinational State of Bolivia welcomes the Secretary-General's efforts in preparing his report on human security (A/64/701). Following extensive review, we believe that the concept of human security is fairly abstract and imprecise, especially when it comes to its implementation on the international level.

In that regard, from the report of the Secretary-General we can see that there are several definitions of human security and that the concept is used in various ways that make it difficult to generalize about it. The use of the concept at country level cannot be extrapolated to the international level because other basic considerations are involved, such as national sovereignty and international security.

It is not enough to say that the concept of human security does not imply the use of force against the sovereignty of States. To the contrary, it is crucial to make it clear that it cannot entail any form of interference in the internal affairs of any country in a way that undermines its sovereignty. A concept on a par with — or worse, that even rises above — the principles of non-intervention, national sovereignty and territorial integrity poses a threat to world peace. Thus, any partiality or limitation that focuses on certain sectors, as we glean from the report, can sap the integrity of the concept and poses a risk that the concept could be interpreted in a narrow sense.

The report of the Secretary-General raises many questions by suggesting that the existence of weak governmental institutions is one of the causes of human insecurity. We wonder who is to determine when a governmental institution is weak. The financial crisis sparked by weak governmental regulatory institutions in developed countries has led to a serious situation of human insecurity throughout the world.

Can all the countries of the world now intervene in those weak institutions of the North? Or, as always, is this just a one-way concept to perpetuate a posture of interference and conditionality vis-à-vis developing countries?

I point that out because in citing various elements and examples, the report fails to mention many causes, such as the instability and crises in developing countries caused by the policies of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, the establishment of military bases on peaceful continents such as Latin American and the development of genetically modified organisms that affect nature and human health. The report refers to helping countries to reduce tensions resulting from climate change. But it does not say that it is essential for developed countries to quickly and drastically reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. Nor does the report refer to the historic responsibility and ecological debt of developed countries to developing countries, which is the source of much human insecurity.

Another worrying issue is the implication that in the future an effort may be made to link the concepts of human rights and human development with that of security. That is of concern not only because it opens the door for the Security Council to increasingly insert itself in issues that are not in its purview, but also because it frames the issue in terms of threats and fear and, as a result, feeds the type of psychosis that throughout history has been used to justify acts of aggression against countries and peoples.

With all due respect, we do not share that vision of promoting a life free from threats. What we must do is to foster a life of complete fulfilment for human beings in harmony with nature. We do not think that having to always think of where danger lies and what the next threat is are the way to develop humankind to the fullest. Non-observance of human rights cannot be linked with the concept of threats; it must be linked to the concept of injustice. All our countries must support each other to ensure the effective enjoyment of human rights. That should include, for example, sending a signal to world to proclaim this as the year of the human right to water, instead of expanding a concept that accentuates people's fears and makes them believe that well-being means being free from threats.

The peace we all want requires clear concepts that do not give rise to confusion or bad interpretations. The Plurinational State of Bolivia therefore proposes that it would be better to talk about justice, equality and sustainable development in order to ensure the full enjoyment of human rights.

Mr. Ebner (Austria): Austria fully aligns itself with the statement made yesterday by the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union, as well as with the statement made by the representative of Costa Rica as Chair of the Human Security Network. Please allow me to add some remarks in our national capacity.

Austria has been strongly committed to human security for many years, in particular through our membership in the Human Security Network. Austria appreciates the efforts to carry the human security agenda forward within the United Nations system and warmly welcomes the report of the Secretary-General (A/64/701) as an excellent basis for our discussions. The report frames the concept of human security in a comprehensive manner, helps to clarify some common misperceptions and highlights the added value and practicability of the human security approach.

As pointed out in the report, the concept of human security has emerged as a result of, and in response to, the increased interdependency of threats and challenges. It is placed at the intersection of security, development and human rights. The concept is a cornerstone of Austria's foreign policy, and we are committed to promoting it in a spirit of dialogue, cooperation and consensus-building. Let me give three examples where, in our view, the concept of human security has provided valuable guidance.

First, with regard to the protection of civilians, Austria decided to make the protection of civilians a key priority during our current term as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. That is why we took the initiative of introducing what became resolution 1894 (2009), on the protection of civilians in armed conflict, on the occasion of the tenth anniversary of the Council's initial consideration of the subject. The resolution addresses existing gaps in the protection work of the United Nations, in particular in the field of peacekeeping, and lays out concrete measures to improve the protection of civilians on the ground.

We need to live up to our shared responsibility to effectively respond to situations where the safety and security of civilians is in danger. No conflict justifies

breaches of international humanitarian law or the refusal of access for humanitarian workers to civilians in need. Equally, no conflict justifies impunity for those who have committed serious crimes against civilians. Austria is committed to taking the implementation of that resolution forward in the coming months.

Secondly, the tenth anniversary of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000), on women and peace and security provides us with a unique opportunity to achieve substantive progress in furthering the implementation of that resolution in all four of its areas: participation, prevention, protection and peacebuilding and early recovery. There seems to be wide agreement that the Security Council should seize this opportunity to renew its commitment to women and peace and security and strive for concrete results, in particular with a view to strengthening accountability for the implementation of resolution 1325 (2000).

Austria strongly welcomes the establishment of the position of a Special Representative of the Secretary-General on Sexual Violence in Conflict, and we are pleased that Special Representative Margot Wallström has begun her work with a recent visit to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Resolution 1888 (2009) has further provided the Special Representative with a number of tools at her disposal, such as a team of experts who can be deployed to provide technical support and capacity-building in countries affected by widespread sexual and gender-based violence in conflict.

And finally, on children and armed conflict: as a member of the Human Security Network, and in particular during its tenure as its Chair, Austria gave special priority to the protection of children, who are often targeted during conflict. Austria is fully committed to contributing to protecting and assisting children in situations of armed conflict, bilaterally, in the framework of the European Union and in particular at the United Nations. The United Nations has taken on a leadership role through the Special Representative on Children and Armed Conflict and UNICEF, as well as through the development of a range of specific tools, in particular a monitoring and reporting mechanism on serious child rights violations.

Mr. Carrión-Mena (Ecuador) (*spoke in Spanish*): Ecuador appreciates the Secretary-General's report on human security (A/64/701), which we are discussing today, and recognizes it as a useful tool in our efforts to establish common positions on this subject. My delegation has followed and will continue to follow with interest the development of the concept of human security — no easy task, given the various criteria, positions and concerns, many of them legitimate, that have been put forward by delegations. We are nonetheless sure that the discussion will help develop the subject so as to allow us to achieve consensus on a definition and an understanding which all Member States can endorse.

I would like to emphasize the report's statement that that "[h]uman security is based on a fundamental understanding that Governments retain the primary role for ensuring the survival, livelihood and dignity of their citizens" (*A/64/701, summary*) and that it "encompasses freedom from fear, freedom from want and freedom to live in dignity" (*para. 4*). My country shares these aims, particularly since our own political constitution affirms the right to a life of dignity, on the basis of which our National Development Plan and National Plan for Well-Being were designed for the sustained and comprehensive development of humankind.

It is precisely on these foundations that we have launched a national project, with international scope, that I would like to describe today: the Yasuní ITT Initiative, an innovative, visionary proposal for sustainable development in my country whereby my Government has committed itself not to exploit petroleum resources — in an area rich in hydrocarbon deposits — in Yasuní National Park deep in the Ecuadorian Amazon. In this way we are protecting the indigenous peoples living in voluntary isolation in the area; we are not deforesting; we are preserving the area's mega-biodiversity, avoiding emissions and proposing to change our country's energy sources. The project has a broad, integrated, people-centred scope. Its vital components include: climate change; sustainable development; human, economic and social rights; international solidarity; and, of course, peace. We are close to concluding negotiations for establishing an international trust fund to be administered by the United Nations Development Programme, which will permit this unique idea to endure and will promote real and practical sustainability for our planet.

Some of the aims of the project are related to those expressed in the Secretary-General's report on human security. The common interests and vision initiated by Japan, among others, which can spur the development of States and, especially, of their peoples, are why Ecuador will participate positively in achieving a definition and understanding of human security in line with our concepts and interests.

The report contains a number of definitions of and references to human security; one, in fact, mentions Ecuador, which, in article 393 of its political constitution, declares that

> "The State shall guarantee human security by integrated policies and actions, in order to promote the peaceful human coexistence, foster a culture of peace and prevent violence and discrimination and the commission of crimes and misdemeanours."

This mandate is expressed in a national context where the primary role and participation lies with the State, which must ultimately provide the right to a life of dignity for every citizen of Ecuador.

My delegation considers that human security, in the international context, is a work in progress, evolving in the light of the growing interdependence of vulnerabilities facing peoples and communities. We maintain that human security, because it is multidimensional and firmly human-based, must investigate and take into account additional elements, including the situation of international migrants and those displaced by internal conflicts; and that it should analyse the relationship between human security and its contribution to processes that can lead to sustainable development and the fulfilment of the Millennium Development Goals.

Ecuador stresses the following as elements in our participation in building and disseminating the concept of human security: first, we should be guided by respect for the principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations, particularly the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and non-intervention; secondly, that its aims be people-centred in order to promote human, economic and social rights and to favour sustainable development; thirdly, that its aims should not restrict or limit the principal role of the State in its national territory, but rather should strengthen it; and finally, the natural framework for all of this is the General Assembly, and its scope should be clarified in order to avoid any possible subsequent invocation of Chapter VII of the Charter relating to the Security Council.

Some of these elements have also been outlined in the Secretary-General's report and mentioned by other delegations before me. Their comments help to bring greater consistency to this proposal, as clarifying these aspects will give it more certainty and ensure a joint effort free of fear and reservations.

Mrs. Juul (Norway): Let me first of all thank the President for convening this meeting, and the Secretary-General for his report on human security (A/64/701) — the first of its kind. It is an excellent report that helps us to clarify and show the relevance of this concept in very educational terms. That was needed.

Norway is a member of the Human Security Network. We thank Costa Rica for its tireless efforts to promote human security. We fully subscribe to its statement made earlier on behalf of the Network. I would also like to express Norway's great appreciation to Japan for its leadership on human security, both at home and on the international stage.

The time has now come for all of us to give this valuable concept the attention it deserves. Why? The concept of human security connects the dots of an interdependent world. It provides direction to our endeavours to promote better policy coherence so that our policies for peace, human rights and development can become mutually reinforcing to a greater extent than currently is the case.

The crux of the matter is a framework for international cooperation that enables States and local communities to protect the freedom of their people — their freedom from fear, freedom from want and freedom to live in dignity — by empowering the individual human being. This concept has particular relevance in a world where rapid global integration has created not only great economic gains, but also an unprecedented concentration of wealth and power within and across borders, thus undermining social stability and peace.

We believe that the concept of human security can do for protection and peace what the concept of human development has done for economic policy thinking — bring equality, fairness and justice into the equation. Norway therefore supports the initiative of

developing a draft resolution of the General Assembly on human security.

Mrs. Rubiales de Chamorro (Nicaragua) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation would like to thank the President for having organized this important debate on human security, at which we should openly and transparently discuss an issue on which it has not yet been possible to achieve a definition that enjoys the consensus of the international community. We would also like to thank Japan for its leadership on this issue.

Our delegation has read with interest the report of the Secretary-General (A/64/701), whose efforts we appreciate. However, we are concerned that the Secretariat has already adopted measures on this issue as if it had already been defined and agreed by Member States. The reform proposed by the Secretary-General does not have a clearly established mandate, given that, in the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), heads of State and Government committed themselves only to considering and defining the concept of human security in the General Assembly. That is the process in which we are currently involved.

The report is a compilation of the various opinions on the issue that could lend themselves to multiple different interpretations and definitions. It covers aspects ranging from the identification of the new concept of human security within the concept of human development to others that could lead to violations of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations, such as non-interference and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, the non-use of force and human rights violations.

At the United Nations, only the General Assembly has the purview to discuss such issues so that States may fully share their experiences and learn best practices. There are many good practices in developing countries that we could share with developed countries, especially when it comes to placing people at the heart of policies and humanizing policies and Government programmes.

The security of people is the direct responsibility of States; it is up to them to ensure it and to prevent situations that jeopardize it. The United Nations should support national plans upon the request of States and in line with the principles to which I have already referred.

Nicaragua's national reconciliation and unity Government defines human security on the basis of its human development programme, which each State should provide. We believe that key elements for ensuring the security and development of our people include job creation, social investment in health and education, and the establishment of conditions in which all people have the opportunity to live better, as security is built through development.

In our country, we have created an integrated humanist model of development, based on the power of citizens, that is designed to overcome poverty. The Nicaraguan people and their historic, cultural, political, economic and social experiences are at the heart of that model. The ultimate goal of this new model is the survival and fulfilment of human beings and structural changes to overcome exclusion and liberate the human development potential of Nicaraguans, in particular the poorest, women, young people, native peoples, descendants of Africans and the handicapped, among others. Growth is the criterion for success, as are the elimination of poverty and hunger and the establishment of conditions conducive to the full development of all Nicaraguans in a sovereign, independent country united with all the peoples of the world.

We give shape to the concept of human development by increasing opportunities for individuals and expanding their capacity, while at the same time ensuring full observance of their human rights and basic freedoms. State institutions also provide and guarantee our people the range of opportunities necessary to ensuring both their survival and their effective exercise of freedoms whereby they can develop fully. That is a crucial focus of the citizen-driven development model. That is how we ensure the human security of our people. We would like to see these concepts of human security reflected in any future definition of the subject.

Our efforts to ensure the human security of our people are reflected in the acknowledgements we have received over the past three years from agencies of the United Nations system, which have recognized the role of the Government of Nicaragua in protecting native populations and restoring their rights, as well as our policies to ensure food and nutrition sovereignty and security, our poverty-reduction policies and, lastly, our status as a country of full literacy.

In conclusion, the subject of human security should continue to be discussed by the General Assembly, where 192 States that have a voice and a vote will, we hope, be able to come to a consensus definition. If the international community is truly interested in the subject of human security, it should begin to demonstrate that by moving ahead on areas that most affect human security, such as, inter alia, the right of the Palestinian people to a State on their own territory, total and complete nuclear disarmament, a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions in order to ensure that global warming is limited to less than 1.5 degrees centigrade, and the fulfilment by the developed countries of their commitments to eradicating world poverty.

Ms. Picco (Monaco) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Monaco recognizes and welcomes the great support of Member States for advancing the concept of human security since the General Assembly's thematic debate on human security in May 2008.

We have seen major progress in the understanding of human security in response to the commitment undertaken by the heads of State and Government at the 2005 World Summit, which reflects the need to address, together and with concrete action, the myriad crises that, as the report of the Secretary-General (A/64/701) recalls, have affected us all in recent times. As we prepare to evaluate the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals, the right of all human beings to live in freedom and dignity, shielded from poverty, despair, fear and want, is at the heart of our priorities. It is therefore high time that we pursue our efforts in favour of human security in order to respond appropriately to targeted situations.

The first report of the Secretary-General is particularly significant in that it outlines the evolution of this concept, which is at the heart of the principles, activities and priorities of our Organization at the dawn of the twenty-first century.

We are working to ensure that all people, in particular the most vulnerable, are able to enjoy all their rights and to realize their full potential on an equal footing. The crises that we have endured since 2008 — rising food and oil prices, economic and financial turmoil, conflict situations, climate change and natural catastrophes, the spread of infectious diseases and other health risks — have taught us that the threats of our time are interlinked and transnational, and therefore demand an integrated and coordinated response. To that end, every Government must build robust institutions and to facilitate equitable social development. All States must promote and ensure respect for the rule of law, which is the lynchpin of the peace and security of their citizens. The advancement of the values we all share within the international agenda will build our capacities and contribute to the achievement of our common objectives.

A global approach based on a broadened understanding of human security would enable us, on the one hand, to develop mechanisms to rise to emerging challenges and, on the other, to avert situations that threaten civilian populations and to support early warning systems that would reduce their impact and identify their underlying causes. In that respect, our Government underscores the importance of promoting the concept of human security, which undoubtedly brings added value to our work.

The Government of the Principality has always pursued policies of people-centred international cooperation, seeking to improve living conditions and development, particularly for the most vulnerable, women, children and the disabled. We therefore wish to add our voice to the groundswell of support in favour of promoting and strengthening human security.

Ms. Blum (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Colombia has taken note of the report of the Secretary-General on human security (A/64/701). My country thanks the President of the General Assembly for having convened this debate, and recognizes the active role played by Japan in advancing discussions on this item.

My delegation reaffirms that, as was decided at the 2005 World Summit, the General Assembly is the appropriate forum for States to consider and define the concept, scope and possible contributions of human security. Given the implications of this exercise, the broad participation of all Member States is essential if we are to have a fruitful discussion and achieve an outcome that reflects general consensus among States.

The right of people to live in freedom, peace and dignity is reflected in the objectives and constitutional foundations of the Colombian State, whose national policies are centred on three areas: the construction of security based on democracy, socially responsible

investment and social cohesion based on freedoms. The applied actions and positive transformation that have been carried out in Colombia in each of these areas in recent years respond to the aspirations to development, security, peace, and the protection of rights expressed at the 2005 World Summit.

In the discussion on a possible definition of the concept of human security, we believe that certain criteria must be taken into account. First, it is important that our development of the scope and application of the concept of human security contribute to a comprehensive consolidation of the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations. A comprehensive and appropriate definition of human security would contribute to promoting friendly relations among nations and international cooperation on economic, social, cultural and humanitarian matters. It would also promote development, human rights and non-intervention in the internal affairs of States.

Secondly, it is important that the concept of human security contribute to preserving the various commitments and definitions adopted by the United Nations in various areas, which are very often the product of complex discussions. We note that the report of the Secretary-General suggests that we analyze how various social, economic, political, environmental and cultural problems are related to the issue of human security. In each of these fields, the Organization has established actions that encourage States, the international community, civil society and other relevant players to act. Human security should not change but must promote the application of political agreements and international normative frameworks as defined by the Organization.

Thirdly, the report before us today mentions, among various common definitions of human security, three aspects: the importance of the concept in dealing with multiple and complex threats; the role of the protection and empowerment of individuals as a basis for and goal of security; and the prohibition of the use of force against the sovereignty of States. In this respect, it is important to stress once again that a definition of human security should contain operational aspects that clearly recognize the lead and inalienable responsibility of States for ensuring human security and the importance of strengthening national capacities to that end. We should also specify the supporting role that can be played by the international community through cooperation and assistance, in coordination with national development policies and plans.

Finally, the identification of areas in which the concept of human security could apply will depend on the scope of its definition. The Secretary-General's report suggests some problems and global crises as potential areas of application of this notion. We should examine with a global perspective other international problems that impact the dignity and security of persons and affect countries in all regions. It will be up to States to evaluate in each area the necessity and added value of applying the concept.

The rights of all people to live free from fear and want and to have equal opportunity to enjoy all their rights and fully develop their human potential are inarguable objectives that all States should pursue. We reiterate that this debate of the General Assembly should help us to find a common understanding of human security. Intergovernmental consensus on this issue is a necessary objective if we are to make headway in our integration of the concept into United Nations activities, including its various agencies, funds and programmes.

Mr. Oussein (Comoros) (*spoke in French*): Yesterday and today, we have heard a number of very incisive analyses and proposals from speakers who preceded me in elaborating on the important subject of human security. I will therefore be brief.

I would like to begin by thanking the President of the Assembly for organizing this important debate. My thanks go also to the Secretary-General for the quality and clarity of his report (A/64/701), and to the Friends of Human Security, chaired by Japan and Mexico, for their efforts to advance a common understanding of this issue, which has raised some concerns, notably over the relationship between human security and national sovereignty and the distinction between this concept and the responsibility to protect. We believe that the Secretary-General's report should dissipate those concerns, in that it defines the concept, both in theory and application, as an indispensable tool for addressing the many crises and challenges facing the international community.

This concept, as everyone knows, has always been of interest to the international community and regional and subregional organizations in that, as redefined, it takes into account not only the comprehensive respect for human dignity and human

rights, but also the creation of the political, economic, social, cultural and environmental conditions for the exercise of those rights, without reference to which it is impossible to reasonably discuss human security. Emphasis is thus placed on the indivisible links among peace, security and development. This was reaffirmed by the League of Arab States and the African Union, notably in their Non-Aggression and Common Defence Pact. Nevertheless, in defining this concept we will need to strive resolutely to eradicate poverty and eliminate inequalities through reform of the international economic order, and to pay special attention to the right to development as a right of the highest priority.

I would like to conclude by highlighting the central place the concept of human security should occupy in United Nations activities, and by expressing the hope that our debate will become an important resource for future deliberation.

Mr. Sow (Guinea) (*spoke in French*): Through me, the Republic of Guinea wishes to express its gratitude to the President of the Assembly for convening this important debate on the Secretary-General's report (A/64/701), which highlights the progress that has been achieved in advancing human security, pursuant to the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1).

At the outset, I would like to congratulate Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon on the quality and richness of his report, which takes stock of the activities, initiatives and major programmes devoted to human security undertaken by Member States and the international community as a whole. We also thank the Governments, civil society groups, eminent personalities, and the Friends of Human Security, which have made a great contribution to defining and implementing the concept of human security.

The Republic of Guinea has actively participated in various meetings on this issue and welcomes the gradual emergence of an international consensus on the need to adopt approaches to the definition of the concept of human security that are global, integrated, people-centred and founded in the principles of the United Nations Charter.

We welcome, in this context, the stress laid in the Secretary-General's on elements common to all definitions of human security. What emerges is that human security is based on the establishment of what the African Union calls the

> "social, economic, political, environmental and cultural conditions necessary for survival and the dignity of the individual, including the protection of and respect for human rights, good governance and ensuring that each individual is guaranteed the opportunities and choices for his complete development".

This human-centred approach naturally entails responsibilities for individuals and populations as well as for States. We support the relevant sections of the Secretary-General's report that underscore the key role of Governments and populations in matters of peace, stability, development and the implementation of the responsibility to protect, in full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States.

Beyond the realm of the theoretical, my country is one of the main beneficiaries of human security projects, thanks to the catalytic role played by Japan and the support of the agencies of the United Nations system. Based on our experience, we believe it essential to develop human security practices, particularly in fragile States or those in post-conflict situations. The United Nations remains the most appropriate multilateral forum for an inclusive and participatory approach by all stakeholders with a view to better defining the concept of human security and advancing it throughout the world.

Guinea welcomes the inclusion of the concept of human security among the priorities of the United Nations, in particular in meeting the many challenges linked to the global financial and economic crisis, food price volatility, food insecurity, the spread of infectious diseases, climate change, conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It is high time to integrate human security projects into the implementation of the United Nations priority objectives, above all in order to facilitate the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs).

In this respect, we need to focus priority attention on the countries that are still far from being able to meet their commitments and on the MDGs that are at risk of not being achieved by 2015. It is particularly urgent to revive the global fight against illiteracy and poverty and to eradicate the scourge of HIV/AIDS by promoting universal access to prevention, treatment,

care and support services. Let us not forget that HIV/AIDS and other major pandemics, such as malaria and tuberculosis, remain the primary cause of death among women of child-bearing age worldwide, of childhood diseases and death in the poorest and most vulnerable regions.

The implementation of a global programme of human security could encourage a better linkage between national, regional and international efforts to achieve the MDGs. We also need to ensure that the political will fueled by the movement in favour of human security is reinforced by expanding the donor base and a substantial increase in funding to the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security.

In conclusion, my delegation supports the recommendations set forth in the Secretary-General's report and reiterates its commitment to advancing the right of all to live free from want and fear and in dignity.

Mr. Beck (Solomon Islands): I thank the President of the General Assembly for convening this two-day plenary on the concept of human security. Solomon Islands would like to begin by associating itself with the statement issued by Australia on behalf of the Pacific Islands Forum and the statement delivered by the Permanent Representative of Nauru on behalf of the Pacific small island developing State.

My delegation, in our national capacity, would like to share our views, as mandated by the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), in which the General Assembly is requested to discuss and define the concept of human security. Human security is discussed in chapter IV of the Outcome Document, "Human rights and the rule of law". Various definitions have emerged; however, a common definition remains elusive as we continue to seek consensus on the matter.

The ambiguity of the definition of human security is linked and tied to the concept of responsibility to protect, which is another concept that is under discussion within the General Assembly. Human security, as we have heard, is people-centred and about protection and empowerment. Within this debate, being the forty-third speaker, I have more questions than answers. At the end of the day, for us it is about poverty eradication, sustainable development and global action to guarantee the survival of the most vulnerable populations. Sustainable development for us is the principle variable that should guarantee and provide a sense of security to the most vulnerable and marginalized citizens.

Human security is about freedom from want. The two other freedoms — freedom from fear and freedom to live in human dignity — naturally follow. We say this against the backdrop that we live in a divided world where one portion has too much food and the other suffers from a lack of it. Human security is about correcting these imbalances by investing in people to help them help themselves.

My delegation's concern is that our commitment to cooperating remains wanting. Medicines are not widely distributed, the world is getting more militarized, and human rights principles continue to be politicized here in this very Hall, making the application of the concept distant and vague. In other words, we have left the victims to fend for themselves. Genuine dialogue is replaced with confrontation.

I say this as the representative of a country emerging from conflict. Our calls for assistance during our ethnic conflict in 1999 were not heard by the international community until in 2003, when our regional neigbours came to our aid under the Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands.

What is troubling for us is that each time we come up with concepts and mechanisms to build confidence among ourselves, we continue to fail ourselves. The concept looks good on paper and we hit all the right notes in our statements, but in practice its application reaches only a select few. In many cases, we have created orphans within our United Nations family and an iron fence around some States. The Peacebuilding Commission, for example, was established to reach out to countries emerging from conflict; however, only four countries have since passed before its radar screen.

Many of today's global issues are threat multipliers, creating multidimensional humanitarian threats within the context of climate change, food, energy and financial crisis. However, systematic solutions for correcting the international system — including concluding the Doha Round, making globalization work for all, getting a legally binding agreement within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change process, making the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria available to all and halting the production of weapons — are all left out as solutions.

My delegation wishes to note that this is the second General Assembly debate on the matter since 2005. My delegation further notes that the Secretary-General's report (A/64/701) does not address questions raised at the last debate. For this reason, building a consensus on the concept needs further discussion.

The report makes three recommendations: that the added value of human security be taken into account, that it be mainstreamed in United Nations activities, and that the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security receive support. The report suggests that there is growing recognition of an expanded paradigm of security, which my delegation agrees with. However, the report proposes a fragmented approach to addressing global issues via country-based projects as solutions. It attempts to create a false sense of security and stability by addressing symptoms rather than causes of problems.

The frequency and intensity of disasters is growing so much that stability remains fragile in vulnerable countries. The historical responsibilities of those that trigger those problems are overlooked. Global mechanisms for the implementation of the Millennium Development Goals, the Programme of Action for the Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing States, the Mauritius Strategy, the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001-2010 and climate change programmes are not supported. If we are to take corrective measures, commitments to these mechanisms must be honoured.

Secondly, there needs to be a stronger relationship between the United Nations and Member States. A United Nations country presence is a must. Distant relations are never the same as face-to-face dialogue; they weaken multilateralism and go against all our discussions on one United Nations system and people-centred solutions. It is easier to say this from a distance, but the challenge is to see it work. Solomon Islands is managed by the United Nations remotely from abroad.

In conclusion, seeking a common consensus on human security means we need to look at solutions holistically both at the global level and nationally. Otherwise, we are accepting the argument and the analogy, when discussing the 2005 World Summit Outcome, that the United Nations system operates like a fire truck, putting out fires all over the world without doing anything about those that start the fires.

Mr. La Yifan (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): Since 2005, when the concept of human security found its way into the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), there has been broad engagement among Members of the United Nations and its various agencies in exploration and discussion of this concept. Continued debate within the General Assembly will be conducive to further discussion of this concept and to clarifying our thinking on it.

I wish to emphasize three points. First, introduction of the concept of human security reflects our concern for freedom, dignity and the protection of rights. Human security pertains to many different fields and at present remains an abstract and general concept, on which there is no uniform international agreement. Different countries, international organizations and members of academia have differing interpretations of the concept of human security; there is thus a need to engage in further discussion of the connotations of the concept so as to define it more clearly. We supportive further work being undertaken by the United Nations with a view to achieving consensus.

Secondly, national Governments bear primary responsibility for protecting human security. The international community and external actors can provide constructive assistance. However, in doing so, they ought to respect fully the will of the parties concerned and act in conformity with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.

And thirdly, human security actually pertains to the question of development. The financial crisis, food insecurity, the spread of infectious diseases, climate change and violent conflicts, developing countries have had a more severe and negative impact on developing countries, which are the principal victims. Developing countries face greater problems in guaranteeing that their people are free from hunger, poverty, disease and violations of their rights. Under the current circumstances, the international community should step up its attention to and investment in discussions and efforts in the area of development. Developed countries should strengthen their efforts to assist developing countries, in particular the least developed countries and African countries, and should help them to build their capacity to achieve sustainable development.

Mr. Al Habib (Islamic Republic of Iran): It would indeed be nice if we could expunge or bypass our historical memory. However, we live through history, and historical experiences linger in our minds. History has not stopped; it is with us to this very moment. It sounds extremely naive to forget the past while it follows us into the future. Remembering our bitter historical experiences, we are still confronting a biased international system that is based on the hegemony of the most powerful. In fact, the powerful rule regardless of the extent to which the weak suffer. The discussions and the way they are conducted in this very building, for instance, leave very tenuous grounds for putting one's faith and trust in the current international system and multilateral architecture. What is of particular interest is the selectivity of concerns — from last year's responsibility to protect (R2P) to this year's human security.

It is far from true that some Member States are supporters of human security and some are not. For many, it is not a matter of either liking or disliking new concepts; it is rather an overall lack of confidence in the reliability of the current multilateral and international system, which is characterized by a persistent and huge deficit in the areas of fairness and impartiality.

Resorting to selective approaches and double standards is a common practice. Concepts are regularly and cynically misinterpreted, taken out of their original context or applied arbitrarily against the few, whenever and however desired by the most powerful. At the same time, subjects are not treated in accordance with their merits for the well-being of humanity but with their appeal to the few. Such cases are abundant.

The tendency to promote human security, as currently understood, as a panacea for all the misfortunes of humanity is an attempt to create a mega-concept that bundles together three pillars of United Nations activities: development, peace and security, and human rights. Without clear demarcation and definition, the concept is easily prone to misinterpretation and misuse. Besides, the temptation to overstretch its limits and coverage only amounts to more uncertainty about the concept and its implications.

Meanwhile, the current understanding of human security tends to overlook the underlying causes of the multifaceted and exacerbating crises facing humanity. Most of them are not created by a lack of human security; nor will they be cured by human security alone. The nature and genesis of several crises that we the people of the world have faced in recent years — such as the food, energy and financial crises — have clearly been systemic in nature. And thus, their solution should be mainly sought at that level.

Of course, the consequences of these crises are having severe effects on the daily lives of individuals. However, healing that suffering is impossible without addressing first and foremost the long-standing inequalities and persistent failures at the systemic level. Indeed, the most urgent and immediate threat to humanity emanates from a substantive lack of global security as a result of the misconduct of a few, at the cost of the suffering of the rest.

Referring to the report of the Secretary-General (A/64/701), we would like to distinguish between the report and the ongoing discussions among Member States on human security and its definition, coverage and scope, as part of implementing paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1). While we contribute to such deliberations, we are still unclear about the mandate of Secretary-General to have produced the report. The practice of pushing certain topics while deliberately overlooking the substantiated concerns of several Member States regarding those topics is not acceptable. Furthermore, selectivity in concerns regarding the World Summit Outcome or other important international issues harms the credibility of the results.

Moreover, the report before us seems unfair and partial with respect to the realities regarding discussions on human security. For instance, it does not reflect the sensitivities of and constant concerns raised by so many Member States on human security. The rosy picture in the introductory part of the report totally ignores such concerns regarding the definition and scope of the concept, its coverage, future implications and so on. Such concerns remain and need to be taken into account. The same imbalance was evident again in the composition of the panel at yesterday's informal discussion.

The report, in its attempt to expand the paradigm of security, attempts to define human security as a notion independent of national security. They are not, to our understanding, two distinctive subjects. The overall welfare and security of citizens is an integral

and indivisible part of each State's national security. Besides, the security of Governments and citizens are not two different things, as implied in paragraph 21 of the report.

The report tries to give the impression that human security would address the root causes of human challenges. But it hardly even touches the principal root causes. It confines itself to the community and national levels and almost fully neglects systemic sources of human insecurity.

If, as the advocates claim, the concept intends to address root causes, then perhaps it would be useful to consider the following easy-to-obtain information on the main sources of human insecurity in the economic, social and political spheres: the top five countries to have invaded and occupied the territories of others in recent history; the top five countries with the highest military expenditures; the top five countries with the highest income from the arms trade; the top five destinations for illicit financial outflows; the top five destinations for victims of human trafficking; the top five polluters of the environment and sources of climate change; the top five countries paying the greatest amounts to corrupt officials of other countries; the top five countries which set the highest agricultural subsidies at the expense of the livelihoods of poor farmers in other countries; the top five countries whose pharmaceutical companies exploit intellectual property rights in order to deprive others of access to cheaper medicines; and finally, the top five spenders on blood diamonds and narcotic drugs.

The list, of course, goes on and on. However, the point is that this concept should not be understood, as the report attempts to understand it, as another attempt to place the blame and responsibility for human insecurity around the world on the shoulders of national Governments in developing countries. The part of the report which deals with applying the human security concept to various United Nations priorities reflects the same tendency. We are concerned that future mainstreaming of the concept in United Nations activities will follow the same path.

Moreover, the report is inconsistent in defining the pillars of human security. In paragraph 23, for instance, the concept is confined to enabling and empowerment, while in paragraph 28 it recognizes two pillars for human security, namely empowerment and protection. The notion of protection alludes to the concept of R2P, which the report in fact tries to distinguish to some extent from human security in paragraph 24. The report, however, fails to do so and recognizes by implication the link between R2P and human security. Human security as envisaged in the report is nothing but the nicer face of R2P, which prescribes intervention in the internal affairs of States. We do not share this approach.

It is our understanding that the State's primary and inherent role in providing rule of law is not conditional, as implied in paragraph 20 of the report. Besides, we do not recognize any automatic role for advocates of the human security concept to address the vague so-called root causes of weaknesses in cases where Governments are weak or under threat, as suggested in the same paragraph. Such attempts — if any — must be made upon the request of the national Government concerned, with its full consent, involvement, leadership and ownership.

Full respect for international law and the Charter of the United Nations regarding principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity and non-interference in internal affairs is an essential element for future consideration of the concept at the international level. It should also be recognized that, at the national level, the State is and will remain the only authority with the discretion and responsibility to secure the livelihood, dignity and human rights of all people under its jurisdiction.

In conclusion, we think there remain three main questions in need of a shared and common understanding by Member States: What are the root causes of human insecurity? Who is responsible for human insecurity around the world? And how can sustained human security be ensured for all? It seems that quite varied answers continue to be given to these questions.

Mr. Khalid Mohammed Osman Sidahmed Mohammed Ali (Sudan) (*spoke in Arabic*): Allow me at the outset to thank the President of the General Assembly for having organized this important discussion on human security.

The concept of human security has been a central concern since the creation of humankind. Freedom from want and freedom from fear are important in all religions. In Islam, a special sura of the Koran is dedicated to that topic. It describes summer and winter journeys and a place where people were provided with

food and protected from fear. I am convinced that this concept exists in other religions as well.

My delegation has attentively studied the report of the Secretary-General on human security (A/64/701). It is clear from the report that Member States have not yet agreed on a clear definition of the concept of human security upon which United Nations efforts could be based. Yet, the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security has begun working on a number of activities, which we welcome.

Paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome document (resolution 60/1) sets out a general framework for this concept. It is important for Member States to agree, within the General Assembly, on a practical and specific definition of the concept on which the United Nations could base its future work. This definition should take into consideration the following priorities: full respect for international law and the principles and purposes of the United Nations Charter regarding respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and non-interference in their internal affairs; full respect for State ownership of domestic human security issues, including the ways in which they deal with threats and their causes; and external assistance should be provided within the framework of national ownership and consent by the State concerned and in conformity with international law, the United Nations Charter and national legislation.

The statements we have heard yesterday and today have noted that the definitions and priorities of human security differ from one State and region to another. Yet, certain threats to human security exist at the international level. The United Nations, its organs and its specialized agencies should undertake special efforts in conformity with their respective mandates. The report of the Secretary-General refers to some of the challenges including: climate change; growing poverty; armed conflict; high food and fuel prices; the proliferation of small arms, nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction; the financial and economic crisis; foreign occupation; and unilateral sanctions.

Human security should not be focused upon for political reasons or using double standards. Nor should it be used as a means to create crises and promote war. If we examine the map of today's world we see many ways for the United Nations to participate actively within the framework of achieving human security at the national and regional levels. There are, of course, certain regional threats to human security which regional organizations attempt to address according to their priorities. These require the support and assistance of the United Nations and the international community. At the national level, each country attempts to deal with its own domestic issues and requires regional support and the support of the United Nations in those efforts. The United Nations retains an important and pivotal role in its efforts to activate preventive diplomacy, treat the root causes of crises, achieve sustainable development and find solutions to the international crises that threaten the human security of a large segment of humankind.

Mr. Moktefi (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): At the outset, the Algerian delegation wishes to thank the President of the General Assembly, Mr. Ali Abdussalam Treki, for organizing this important meeting. We also extend our warmest thanks to Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon for introducing yesterday his comprehensive report on human security (A/64/701), prepared in accordance with resolution 60/1, which requested him to update the Assembly on progress made since the 2005 World Summit on defining and promoting human security.

The report before us, inter alia, takes stock of the debates on the new notion of human security and its various definitions. The document is extremely interesting, provides food for thought and contains important research and contributions by eminent personalities. It outlines the interesting experiences of a number of countries with respect to the issue and to the implementation of development projects.

Recalling that today's and yesterday's discussions follow up the thematic debate of the General Assembly on 22 May 2008 on this same topic, Algeria believes that any debate aimed at a future decision on human security falls within the mandate of the General Assembly. Therefore, all discussion among Member States on this issue must conform to the fundamental principles of the United Nations Charter, in particular those concerning respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of States, as well as respect for the right to self-determination of peoples under foreign occupation.

My delegation welcomes the noble and laudable objectives attached to this new concept and notes that

the responses to it have been formulated on the basis of the criteria of ensuring the well-being of every individual in an environment of peace and stability. They represent an attempt to give clear expression to paragraph 143 of the Outcome Document of the 2005 World Summit adopted by our heads of State and Government.

Nevertheless, as we reflect on the meaning of the concept of human security, major questions arise, in particular when there is a risk of impinging on such universally recognized principles as State sovereignty. Concerns remain, in particular with respect to the possibility that the concept of human security could be used as a pretext for interfering in the internal affairs of a State. My delegation therefore questions the true meaning and scope of a phrase in the report according to which "human security does not entail the use of force against the sovereignty of States" (*A/64/701, para. 19*).

Instead of reassurance, this assertion has the opposite effect because it increases suspicion. Paragraph 21 of the same report also raises doubts with respect to the relationship between Governments and citizens by asserting that human security "provides the analytical framework for the creation of genuine possibilities for partnership between Governments and citizens". In reality, that relationship is already governed by various aspects of national legislation and international law. Paragraphs 23 and 24 of the report on the relationship between human security and the responsibility to protect also require further clarification, bearing in mind the sensitivity of that issue.

The Algerian delegation believes that we should be mindful to avoid confusion between human security and attempts to use the responsibility to protect as a pretext to interfere in the internal affairs of countries, in particular between Governments and their citizens. It is a fundamental principle that Governments have the primary responsibility for ensuring the security of their citizens. The responsibility of the international community is complementary, to the extent that its role is limited to the solicitation and consent of the State requesting assistance in strengthening its capacities to meet the challenges and threats it faces.

In the context of this debate, my delegation also has questions on the relationship of the notion of human security to the North-South issue.

In order to dispel confusion, my delegation seeks to understand conclusively the basic difference between human security and the previously enshrined concepts of human development, the right to development, sustainable development and social development. In what way does human security differ from the multidimensional security adopted by the Organization of American States? There is reason to fear that, from the analytical perspective, the proliferation of concepts could hinder our identification of real problems that we would be unable to address because they had been misidentified. An excessively broad definition would necessarily lead to an absence of clarity and analytical rigour.

In view of those questions, the lesson we need to draw at this stage is that there is as yet no consensual and clear definition of the concept of human security. My delegation is therefore convinced that it would be premature at this stage to take any decision on how to integrate or mainstream human security into the activities of the United Nations system.

Miss Al-Thani (Qatar) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation expresses its appreciation for the convening of this meeting and thanks the Secretary-General for preparing his report (A/64/701) and useful summary on human security. We also thank the experts for their participation in the interactive dialogue.

In light of the attention given by Governments, regional and international organizations, non-governmental organizations and academia to the concept of human security, it should be discussed within the intergovernmental framework of the General Assembly, particularly since it has not yet been given a practical and agreed definition. This substantive discussion is therefore of great importance.

It is no wonder that the concept of human security has continued to develop and expand, although its elements and characteristics are not new and are enshrined in the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter. The focused and coordinated efforts of the Assembly to define the concept over the past two decades will add to its value. Hence, we welcome the noble foundations and objectives of human security. Our purpose is to free people from fear and want and to guarantee their dignity.

Some Governments and regional and international organizations have begun to discuss multifaceted human security strategies, agendas and

visions. We stress the need for the application of the concept of human security to be governed by rules that conform to international law in order to avert any violation of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States and to ensure that the concept of national security is not eliminated. We should also address the underlying causes and challenges that threaten human security, such as abject poverty and economic crises.

The Secretary-General's report overlooks the question of foreign occupation, despite its multifaceted impacts. Misuse and double standards are among the primary factors leading to the criticism of principles that are supposed to be beyond criticism, such as the principles of humanitarian intervention, human security and the responsibility to protect.

Out of its belief that peaceful or preventive solutions are more important and legitimate than the use of force, the State of Qatar has made repeated diplomatic efforts, in cooperation with the United Nations and friendly States, to solve regional and international problems and to protect those affected by them.

Security, development and human rights are interlinked. Human security does not differentiate among civil, economic, social, political and cultural rights. Thus, the wise policies of Qatar, led by His Highness Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani — especially the Qatar National Vision 2030 project — are centred on people and on promoting social and economic development in order to safeguard the security and well-being of individual and human rights, which are all aspects of human security. At the forefront of our national priorities is the right to education, especially in times of crisis and armed conflicts. Her Highness Sheikha Mozah Bint Nasser Al Missned, Consort of the Emir of Qatar and a UNESCO Special Envoy, has pointed out the importance of the right to education, especially at the international level.

In conclusion, we look forward to further reports and more open discussion and dialogue to clarify the concept of human security, its elements, objectives, scope and means.

Mr. Jaber (Lebanon): I thank the President of the General Assembly for having convened this discussion on human security. I should also like to thank the Secretary-General for his comprehensive report on this topic (A/64/701) and to commend the efforts made by the Friends of Human Security, in particular Japan and Mexico.

In his report, the Secretary-General mentions that "human security underscores the universality and primacy of a set of freedoms that are fundamental to human life" (*A/64/701, para. 26*). Whether we choose to interpret the concept of security in a narrow sense or in a wider one, it is important to note the developments the world has witnessed over recent decades. There has been an increase in the interaction between peoples in different sectors and among countries as a result of globalization, which, in turn, has led to greater links between the risks and security challenges faced by individuals and societies. Civilians often end up paying the heaviest price in modern conflicts, which are mostly internal. These events, in turn, call for greater efforts to protect them. Thus, the three pillars of the United Nations — security, development and human rights — are interconnected. This interconnectedness is growing in today's world.

Not only may a narrow understanding of security omit serious legitimate concerns and the basic needs of individuals, but it also has a direct impact on people's security and daily lives. Such grave risks include hunger, poverty, infectious diseases, climate change, armed conflicts, occupation, migration and others. On the other hand, we may wonder whether these risks will become easier to analyse theoretically when they are included within a single concept. What is the practical usefulness of human security? We believe it important to explore what could come from developing this concept in a practical manner — that is to say, the practical impact it may have on the lives, security and dignity of individuals all over the world.

We have built together in this Hall an integrated international legal framework to protect human rights. Nonetheless, flagrant violations of these rights remain rampant, especially in situations of conflict and where peoples live under occupation. We have also set for ourselves a set of Millennium Development Goals, which we hope to achieve by 2015. Nonetheless, we see that millions upon millions of people in the world still suffer from famine despite our production of a food surplus of some 10 per cent more than we need.

For all of these reasons, as we endeavour to reach an agreed definition of the concept of human security that corresponds to the real needs of people and societies and to the complementary activities of the

United Nations, Lebanon reaffirms its support, without compromise, for the rights of peoples and individuals to be free from fear and from want, and to exercise their right to live in freedom, with dignity, free from despair and poverty. Thus, we need to keep an open mind and continue our deliberations until we reach a consensus on finding a practical definition of human security.

Mr. Richardson (Saint Kitts and Nevis): Permit me at the outset to express my delegation's appreciation for the convening of this important debate. Human security is an issue that should concern us all, and freedom from fear, along with freedom from want, represent the core tenets of this very institution. It is therefore necessary for the United Nations to take a lead role in the coordination and implementation of approaches to human security with the express support and partnership of all States members of this body. In furthering this discussion, my delegation would like to highlight a few elements as we carry the process forward.

The report of the Secretary General (A/64/701) underscores the fact that human security is in response to current and emerging threats, which can be multiple, complex, interrelated and transnational. For Saint Kitts and Nevis, there are several threats that fit into those categories and that require a coordinated and effective global response.

The report makes mention of the global economic and financial crisis. Saint Kitts and Nevis is a small island developing State. We are also a heavily indebted middle-income country. Those characteristics have placed us in a precarious position in that we are extremely vulnerable to the external shocks brought on by fluctuations in the international economy, while at the same time we are beyond the periphery of urgent attention. Too often we are given cursory consideration. However, our vulnerabilities as well as our high debt prove that we need to be involved in a partnership with the international community to alleviate the current threats to our people and offset similar crises affecting our future generations. We see one aspect of human security, therefore, as the need for our people to be free from the fear of underdevelopment and all that comes as a result of that underdevelopment and that fear.

The linkages and the multidisciplinary nature of human security can be seen when we consider the link between the global economic and financial crisis and the rising crime levels among our young people. The crisis has resulted in limited options for development and economic activity. Saint Kitts and Nevis is dependent on donor countries and donor agencies, as well as on international markets to stimulate our economy. With the crisis we have experienced a withering away of economic options, and with limited economic options, our young people become disaffected. This, my delegation believes, has been one of the contributing factors to the rise in crime among the young people of our societies, and we call for a global response to address this problem.

It is also essential to view crime within the framework of human security and to consider all of its factors. Our societies are at risk. Crime among the young people is a current and future challenge in all societies of the international community, and we need to examine the causes and impact of crime among our young people within the debate on human security.

In terms of health-related threats, we are all aware of the highly infectious diseases that require no passport or visa to travel the world at a rapid pace. These infectious diseases are indeed a threat to human security and require much of our attention. However, we also have the problem of non-communicable diseases as a current and future threat to human well-being. My delegation applauds the recent decision by the General Assembly to convene a high-level meeting, with the participation of heads of State or Government, to address the problems of non-communicable diseases, and we recommend that any discussion on human security take into account the challenges to our peoples as a result of non-communicable diseases, as well as infectious diseases.

Climate change is also one of the most significant threats to human security. The international community faces increased challenges as a result of climate change. Saint Kitts and Nevis proposes a comprehensive and multisectoral approach, and we propose a participatory approach to stemming climate change and its impact on the human security of the entire international community. For Saint Kitts and Nevis and other small island developing States, our very livelihood and existence are threatened by climate change. This problem has to be viewed within the realm of human security as a current and future challenge.

There are many different elements to human security. Member States will view these phenomena in terms that apply to them individually, regionally or strategically. What we must ensure — and that is why this debate is so timely — is that we look beyond our national interests and maintain an international focus.

My delegation understands the importance of the role of Government institutions, and we appreciate the need of some Member States to emphasize the sovereignty of States as well as the responsibility to protect. This is where a true international partnership in moving the process forward becomes necessary. The objective of human security and of the United Nations is to ensure freedom from fear, freedom from want and freedom to live in dignity. Those are rights to be delivered to the entire international community and not just to a select few.

Finally, Saint Kitts and Nevis supports the idea of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security and we would like to see the Fund be used to address a wide cross-section of threats to human security, including those threats that were outlined in this statement.

Mr. Jgenti (Georgia): At the outset, let me join other delegations in expressing gratitude to the President of the General Assembly for organizing this important event and in commending the Secretary-General for his efforts in preparation of the first report on human security (A/64/701). It is indeed an important document and will serve as a very timely platform active discussion among Member States.

In these brief remarks, we would like to draw attention to a problem which has already been mentioned by a number of speakers yesterday and today and which legitimately fits with the human security concept. One of the key dimensions of the concept focuses on the necessity to deal with the humanitarian consequences of wars and military conflicts. In that context, we would single out two particular aspects, namely, the rights of displaced populations to return and the human rights situation in occupied territories.

While reversing the military and political outcome of a foreign invasion and the consequent occupation, something that our region, unfortunately, has witnessed during recent years, might require many years, addressing the human rights and humanitarian needs of war-affected populations is a matter of urgency. Still, we see badly disguised attempts to use the need for political settlements as a pretext not to address the immediate human rights and humanitarian needs of the most vulnerable.

There is a clearly defined need to make the inadmissibility of linking human rights and humanitarian problems with political or legal settlements an integral part of the human security concept. At the very heart of this concept we also see the responsibility of occupying Powers and authorities in effective control to allow unhindered humanitarian access. The concept should be clear in providing effective solutions to the practices of denying the right to an education in one's mother tongue, forced conscription and ethnic-based harassment.

Let me conclude by expressing our strong hope that the urgency of the issues underlined here will eventually find its way into the deliberations of the international community. The evolving concept of human security is comprehensive. Its comprehensiveness comes from its very important humanitarian and human rights components.

Ms. Ochir (Mongolia): Let me join previous speakers in commending the leadership of the President of the General Assembly in convening this formal debate on human security. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his submission to the General Assembly of his first report on human security (A/64/701).

My delegation views this important debate as a substantive follow-up to paragraph 143 of the 2005 World Summit Outcome (resolution 60/1), in which heads of State and Government committed themselves to discussing and defining the notion of human security. A wealth of ideas for our debate was presented yesterday by the panellists in the informal discussion on "People-centered approaches: The added value of human security".

As our discussions reveal, the concept of human security is still evolving. Yet if we take the widely mentioned broad-based definition of human security as encompassing freedom from want, freedom from fear and freedom to live in dignity, with its people-centered approach, it can provide us with an important policy tool for effectively addressing the multifaceted threats and challenges of today's interconnected world.

We believe that human security, as a new approach in the conduct of international relations, could become a powerful force for reforming the United Nations and adapting it to the challenges of the twenty-first century. At the same time, the United Nations is the only universal organization able to advance and practice this important concept. We believe that human security will be best ensured if it is considered as a cross-cutting theme within the United Nations framework. In doing this, it would be important to focus more on vulnerable groups of countries that are the hardest hit by a multitude of crises and pervasive threats, including climate change.

As a member of the Friends of Human Security from its very inception, Mongolia is strongly committed to ensuring human security and promoting human-centered development. Mongolia's 1994 national security concept identified the advancement of human security as one of the fundamental pillars of strengthening national security. Furthermore, our national development strategies — including the 2001-2004 national programme for good governance for human security, our Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and our MDG-based national development strategy for the period through 2021 — are all aimed at ensuring the human security of Mongolians.

The Government has put the provision of high-quality health care and education and decent job opportunities for the people high on its agenda. In order to address the negative impact of the global economic and financial crisis, the Government is proceeding with a policy of targeting social transfers more effectively; strengthening public finances, notably through the passage of a fiscal stability law; and reforming the banking sector. Dealing with the social aspects of the crisis is one of my Government's top priorities. Thus, in November last year, we set up a human development fund designed to pool revenues from the mining sector and implement targeted social transfers to alleviate the burden on the poor and vulnerable. Starting this year, tens of thousands of eligible citizens have benefited from such transfers, helping them sustain their livelihoods.

In addition to suffering from the negative effects of the global financial and economic crisis, Mongolia is highly susceptible to weather-related disasters, including droughts in summer and zuds in winter. This past winter we witnessed an extremely severe zud — a complex natural disaster in which a summer drought is followed by heavy snow coupled with gusty winds and unusually low temperatures at times dropping to -45 or -50 degrees Celsius, and then by a dangerous spring thaw — which destroyed the livelihood of nearly 9,000 herder families who rely on their livestock for income, food and fuel. More than 7.5 million head of livestock, more than 17 per cent of the country's total, have been killed by the disaster. Fifteen of our 21 provinces, home to about 800,000 people, have been declared disaster zones, and another four provinces are seriously affected.

Serious causes of concern are a spike of up to 40 per cent in under-five mortality in zud-affected areas, increased acute and chronic malnutrition, micro-nutrient deficiencies among pregnant women, a lack of access to health care, widespread food insecurity, the loss of livelihoods and severe psychological trauma among herders and their families. The Government is taking a number of relief and assistance measures to address short-term needs. Domestically, public and private-sector organizations have organized nationwide assistance campaigns for herders. The large scale and severity of the disaster, however, prompted the Government to launch last week, together with the United Nations, a consolidated appeal in Geneva and Ulaanbaatar for $18 million to build national capacity for disaster preparedness and response in order to avert shocks of comparable magnitude in future.

I would like to take this opportunity on behalf of the Government of Mongolia to wholeheartedly thank all our bilateral and multilateral partners for providing valuable support and assistance to Mongolia in its efforts to meet the formidable challenges of this natural disaster. Here, I would also like to highlight the importance of the work of the United Nations Human Security Trust Fund, which has financed a number of important projects in Mongolia aimed at improving the provision of social services and promoting social equality by fostering human security in remote rural areas of the country.

In conclusion, my delegation remains hopeful that this formal debate of the General Assembly will further facilitate a focused exchange of views on the multidimensional scope of human security and explore ways to apply it within the framework of the United Nations. In this respect, the idea of having more country-specific and regional analysis of the perception of human security threats and responses to them deserves, in our view, closer consideration.

Mrs. Khoudaverdian (Armenia): Let me begin by joining previous speakers in thanking the Secretary-General for his report on human security (A/64/701), submitted pursuant to General Assembly resolution 60/1. We would also like to express our gratitude to the President of the General Assembly for convening this important plenary meeting and for his initiative in organizing the panel discussion.

Armenia fully aligns itself with the statement delivered yesterday by the representative of Spain on behalf of the European Union, and we would like to make a few brief observations in our national capacity.

We appreciate the contributions made by the Friends of Human Security in advancing the concept of human security, as well as the support for the process by various United Nations programmes and funds. Providing an update on developments related to the advancement of human security since the 2005 World Summit, as we continue our discourse and advance key initiatives relating to that concept, is indeed an important and timely endeavour. Though this is not an easy task, the noble goals of this evolving process, such as the promotion of peace and stability and the advancement of sustainable development and societal change at the national, regional and international level, require a full commitment from all of us.

The concept of security has traditionally been tied to the security of States, and we believe that the notion of human security, which encompasses the political, economic and social needs of people, is a fundamentally new way of approaching security. It is also a more wholesome way of thinking. We appreciate the report's observations regarding the challenges facing efforts to define human security, and we agree with previous speakers who stressed the importance of crucial areas and issues in thinking about human security, such as the promotion of human rights, economic development, social justice, the impact of climate change and environmental protection.

In particular, in our capacity as Chair of the Commission on the Status of Women, we would like to stress the importance of the protection of women and their empowerment in this context. The challenge of gender inequality in the public and private spheres continues to undermine the security of women around the world. More often than not, be it in armed conflict or in the context of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, women and children are the most vulnerable segments of the population. Yet they receive the least support at the national and international levels. Here, we must continue to take concrete steps towards the implementation of the Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action and the outcomes of the twenty-third special session of the General Assembly. There is a concern that promoting the concept of human security may lead to overlapping and duplication of efforts in these critical areas. There is thus a need to define the concept of human security very precisely so as not to create tension between it and other concepts and development issues.

In this regard, we affirmatively note the distinction made in the report between the concepts of human security and the responsibility to protect. At the same time, we continue to focus on decisive measures to eliminate once and for all the very possibility of recurrence of genocides, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity by addressing the root causes of conflicts that give rise to such atrocities. It is here that the concept of human security will play a role based on an expanded understanding of security that aims to integrate the goals of freedom from fear and freedom to live in dignity through people-centered, comprehensive strategies. Once properly defined, the concept of human security will guide our efforts towards the early prevention of the factors that lead to conflict in the first place. We have to think about further developing prevention mechanisms that safeguard the most vulnerable groups, including women, children and the displaced.

My delegation welcomes the report and supports further discussions on this topic. Armenia believes that the concept of human security will enhance and enrich our understanding of security in the twenty-first century and further complement the work of the United Nations and Member States in this area, resulting in more effective policymaking and strategies.

The Acting President (*spoke in Spanish*): The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda items 48 and 114.

The meeting rose at 1.30 p.m.

United Nations A/64/PV.90

General Assembly
Sixty-fourth session

Official Records

90th plenary meeting
Thursday, 3 June 2010, 3 p.m.
New York

President: Mr. Ali Abdussalam Treki ..... (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya)

In the absence of the President, Mr. Mohamed (Maldives), Vice-President, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 3.15 p.m.

Agenda item 136 (*continued*)

Scale of assessments for the apportionment of the expenses of the United Nations (A/64/631/Add.10)

The Acting President: Before proceeding further, I should like to draw the attention of the General Assembly to document A/64/631/Add.10, in which the Secretary-General informs the President of the General Assembly that, since the issuance of his communications contained in documents A/64/631 and addenda 1 to 9, Palau has made the necessary payments to reduce its arrears below the amount specified in Article 19 of the Charter. May I take it that the General Assembly duly takes note of the information contained in this document?

It was so decided.

Agenda item 48 (*continued*)

Integrated and coordinated implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of the major United Nations conferences and summits in the economic, social and related fields

Draft resolution (A/64/L.53)

The Acting President: Members will recall that the General Assembly held its debate on agenda item 48 jointly with agenda items 114, 120 and 121 at the 47th plenary meeting, on 16 November 2009, as well as jointly with agenda item 114 at the 88th plenary meeting, on 20 May 2010.

Members will also recall that, under agenda items 48 and 114, the Assembly adopted resolution 64/184 at its 66th plenary meeting, on 21 December 2009, and decision 64/555 at its 82nd plenary meeting, on 15 April 2010.

I now give the floor to the representative of Oman to introduce draft resolution A/64/L.53.

Mr. Al-Hinai (Oman): Members may recall the report of the Secretary-General entitled "World Statistics Day" contained in document E/CN.3/2010/12, which relayed a proposal to organize World Statistics Day on 20 October 2010 in order to celebrate the many achievements of official statistics. At the recently concluded forty-first session of the Statistical Commission, members of the Commission adopted decision 41/109, entitled "World Statistics Day", which endorsed 20 October 2010 as the date for the first World Statistics Day.

I have the honour to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/64/L.53, entitled "World Statistics Day", sponsored by the following Member States: Australia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Egypt, Italy, Lithuania, Morocco, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation and Oman.

Since the publication of document A/64/L.53, there have been additional sponsors, as follows: Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Chile,

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room U-506. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

10-38708 (E)

Please recycle

China, Colombia, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Luxembourg, Maldives, Mauritania, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Peru, Qatar, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo and Viet Nam.

The draft resolution recalls both the report of the Secretary-General and decision 41/109 of the Statistical Commission. Operative paragraphs 1 and 2 respectively designate 20 October 2010 as World Statistics Day and invite Member States, organs of the United Nations system, other international and regional organizations, civil society and non-governmental organizations to observe World Statistics Day in an appropriate manner.

I had the honour to hold informal consultations on the draft resolution before us, which resulted in agreement on all the paragraphs contained therein. I commend the draft resolution for adoption by the General Assembly.

The Acting President: I have been informed that Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Jamaica, Saint Lucia, Singapore have also requested to become sponsors of draft resolution A/64/L.53.

The Assembly will now take action on draft resolution A/64/L.53, entitled "World Statistics Day". May I take it that the Assembly decides to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/64/L.53 was adopted (resolution 64/267).

The Acting President: The General Assembly has thus concluded this stage of its consideration of agenda item 48.

Agenda item 7 (*continued*)

Organization of work, adoption of the agenda and allocation of items

The Acting President: I now invite the General Assembly to turn its attention to a note by the Secretary-General contained in document A/64/102/Rev.1/Add.1, under sub-item (b) of agenda item 112, concerning the appointment of a member of the Committee on Contributions. Members will recall that the General Assembly concluded its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 112 at its 48th plenary meeting, on 19 November 2009.

In order to enable the General Assembly to consider the note of the Secretary-General, it will be necessary to reopen consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 112.

May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to reopen consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 112?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: Members will also recall that at its 2nd plenary meeting, on 18 September 2009, the General Assembly allocated this sub-item to the Fifth Committee. In order for the Assembly to proceed expeditiously on this sub-item, may I take that the Assembly agrees to consider this sub-item directly in plenary meeting? There appears to be no objection.

It was so decided.

The Acting President: May I further take it that the Assembly agrees to proceed immediately to the consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 112? As I see no objection, we shall proceed accordingly.

Agenda item 112 (*continued*)

Appointments to fill vacancies in subsidiary organs and other appointments

(b) Appointment of members of the Committee on Contributions

Note by the Secretary-General (A/64/102/Rev.1/Add.1)

The Acting President: In his note, the Secretary-General informs the General Assembly that he has received notification of the resignation of Mr. Vyacheslav Anatolievich Logutov of the Russian Federation from the Committee on Contributions, effective 20 May 2010. The Assembly will therefore be required to appoint, at its current session, a person to fill the remaining portion of the term of office of Mr. Logutov, that is, until 31 December 2011.

The Secretary-General also informs the General Assembly that the Government of the Russian Federation has nominated Mr. Andrei Vitalievitch Kovalenko to fill the vacancy arising from the resignation of Mr. Logutov.

The note further states that the Secretariat was informed by the Chairperson of the Group of Eastern European States that the candidature of Mr. Kovalenko has been endorsed by the Group.

May I therefore take it that it is the wish of the Assembly to appoint Mr. Andrei Vitalievitch Kovalenko as a member of the Committee on Contributions for a term of office beginning on 3 June 2010 and ending on 31 December 2011?

It was so decided.

The Acting President: May I take it that it is the wish of the General Assembly to conclude its consideration of sub-item (b) of agenda item 112?

It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 3.25 p.m.